

REMARKS

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 2-7, 10-16, and 18 and amended claims 1, 8, 9, and 17 are in this application.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,528).

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

“...wavelet inverse transform means for inverse transforming **said only coefficients of said specified area** extracted from said decoding object coefficient extracting means ...” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

In explaining the above rejection, the Examiner relied on col. 5, line 18 to col. 6, line 18 and col. 8, lines 20-30 of Li to disclose the wavelet inverse transform means. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Li as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Li”) do not disclose the above-recited feature. As such, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Li.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claim 8 is believed to be distinguishable from Li

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Li for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,535)

Amended independent claims 9 and 17 include features similar to those of claim 1, and as such, are believed to be distinguishable from Li. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Lee to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Li. Accordingly, amended independent claims 9 and 17 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Li and Lee.

Claims 10-16 and 18 depend from one of claims 9 and 17, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Li and Lee.

The Examiner has made of record, but not applied, several documents. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800